

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research
January 17, 2002
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees

Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Cramer, Darin	DNR
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Glass, Domoni	
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Lippke, Bruce	University of Washington
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-chair
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Palmquist, Robert	NWIFC
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	WDFW, CMER Co-chair
Raines, Mary	NWIFC
Rochelle, Jim	
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Minutes

November and December minutes were approved as distributed.

Budget Discussion

McNaughton distributed a new version of the budget spreadsheet. There are few additions such as DNR contract and/or tracking numbers and assigned contract manager (DNR, USF&WS, NWIFC). Older projects have been rearranged into program areas for clarity. There is still a thick black line in the middle of the sheet that separates the most recently approved projects in order of funding priority. All bull trout monies from USF&WS have been detailed in this budget sheet as well.

The budget illustrates that this is a \$17 million program over a 5-year period. If full funding continues, there will be approximately \$1.7 million available over the next 3 years for new projects that have not been initiated or approved to date. This also shows that only 10% of the total program budget remains unallocated so we must be careful in how we spend the remainder.

The bottom line is still negative (\$132,000) for this biennium. If all approved projects move forward, we will be operating at a deficit. Bolded dollars are dollars that have already been spent. Projects below the

CMER Minutes Continued

line that are fully funded now include hardwood conversion, fish passage, and the roads program (3 projects). Mass wasting would be short by \$22,000. The rest of the projects cannot be funded until next year's federal monies become available. Federal funds listed under FY 2002 can be carried over until June 2003.

If there are projects that will not get off the ground or are substantially under budget, we need to know that now.

Assignment to SAGs: By February 1, provide McNaughton with information about whether your allocated monies will be used by June 2003 of this year. If your SAG does not report in, we will assume that the money cannot be spent and it will be re-allocated accordingly. McNaughton will distribute a revised spreadsheet as soon after February 1 as is possible. SAGs that have projects that are currently unfunded are asked to have study plans, and to the extent possible, RFPs ready to submit to CMER by the February 21 CMER meeting.

SAG Updates

RSAG: RSAG is seeking to formalize the \$200,000 that is earmarked for DFC fieldwork and to finalize the Type F/N Effectiveness study so that it can be submitted for SRC review.

Hunter explained why using the NWIFC as the contract administrator is the best way to proceed with the DFC study. The commission has done the subcontracting related to this study in the past and they know the parties involved. Furthermore, the Commission is not charging overhead. Pavel provided more background, stating that the Commission had managed the monitoring program and interested parties decided that the process was not going well and a new program was subsequently established. The DFC was seen as a high priority and so the Commission was chosen to do it. Hunter added that there was an RFP for this and the Commission got the competitive bid. Schuett-Hames said that RSAG has asked CMER staff to provide the management. The Commission needs access to the money to hire crews to go out and collect the information. **CMER approved the release of the funds to the NWIFC to perform the DFC study.**

CMER also asked that the stakeholder group discuss what we are doing with this study, how it is proceeding, what we will do with the data, and why we are collecting it. The stakeholders will then brief policy on the project to ensure that they remain informed of progress. Also, DFC will be the topic discussed during the CMER science session on February 21st.

The Type F/N effectiveness group has released a study plan that has gone through at least five drafts over the last nine months. RSAG has reviewed the latest study plan and it has been revised and forwarded to CMER. RSAG is now recommending that this draft be submitted for SRC review, with the goal of getting a pilot study in the field this summer. **CMER approved this request unanimously.** Hunter and McNaughton will work together to get this study plan to the SRC.

The hardwood RFP was submitted in early December and there were two respondents. The oversight committee put some additional language in the RFP to solicit more responses. This was reissued and it is due in mid-February.

UPSAG: Raines said that the scope of work for the Analysis of 2001 Perennial Stream Survey Pilot Field Data is moving forward. UPSAG would like CMER to consider the revised scope of work that will go out in the next day or two and whether this project can be approved without going through SRC review.

The Np Technical Group and UPSAG members have now had a chance to comment on the scope of work and there is conceptual agreement. UPSAG is proposing that much of the work be done in-house because working with a hired contractor would not appreciably reduce the work load for staff and stakeholder cooperators. The scope of work details who would be responsible for specific tasks.

CMER Minutes Continued

CMER members are asked to review and approve or provide comments on 1) the scope of work, 2) the assignment of tasks and 3) the recommendation that the scope of work not go through SRC review. A background document with justification on the non-SRC review recommendation will be provided with the scope of work. When the scope of work is distributed, the time frame for comments will be included. If the timely responding CMER member comments indicate there is unanimous approval of the above requests as submitted, then the scope of work will be considered approved. If not, the scope of work will be considered at the next CMER meeting and a vote will be taken then.

ISAG: This committee may need more money for fieldwork this year but they are unsure at this time and may not be able to get this under contract by June.

BTSAG: The committee has many projects going on that they are trying to get contracted and they are running into some glitches.

WETSAG: McNaughton said that Parks requested that the Wetlands workshop proceed regardless of where the funding comes from. Quinn indicated that WETSAG should come prepared to argue for funding at the next meeting based on changes in allocation that may occur.

LWAG: MacCracken said that the RMZ resample has been awarded to LGL and the contractor is in the process of drafting a revised study plan. The SRC process went fairly smoothly for this study. McNaughton added that the quality of the reviews was high. One of the things that will be clarified in the new study plan is how the funding will be broken out and what will be looked at each year. This will help policy to better understand the project when it comes to them for final approval. DNR is unable to sign this contract until they are assured funding by the legislature and the data will be owned by CMER.

Secondly, LWAG has a proposal for project development funds usage, specifically for a workshop on alternatives to Null Hypothesis Testing with Probabilistic Statistics for Data Analyses and Inference. Further clarification of the budget requests for this project is needed. MacCracken will work with Raines to further identify possible ways to pay for this type of workshop and what the funds will cover and suggestions for what type of workshop constitutes a CMER workshop.

Both LWAG proposals will be considered next month.

SAGE: Pederson said that the eastside nomograph RFP is in draft form and few comments have been received. The work group has now met again to determine the direction that the project should take. Glass added that they have \$7,000 to identify baseline data (pre-fire) and they are trying to get this contracted. The contractor is already working. The RFP for eastside disturbance regimes has been advertised and they got eight bidders. They are using a scoring system, borrowed from LWAG, and review is in progress with Ron Johnson.

SRC Update: McNaughton said that the SRC has received two items (RMZ resample and TFW publication 118, slope stability). Both of those reviews are now complete and many lessons have been learned. Reducing delay is paramount and we will be meeting with the SRC later in January to discuss this and other concerns. Additional reviewers are still needed (the database now consists of about 100). Raines asked when UPSAG could expect review materials on the TFW 118. McNaughton said very soon.

New Hire Work Assignments:

Work assignments are needed for the new NWIFC staff. Jackson said that they would like help with the Bull Trout overlay site selection. This is similar to the Type F/N effectiveness sites. Schuett-Hames said that they have not hired this person yet but are trying. All additional suggestions for assignments should be sent to Schuett-Hames.

CMER Minutes Continued

Agenda for February 21 CMER Meeting:

Approval of January minutes

CMER Website Discussion

RFP advertisement (how do we generate more responses)

Budget reallocations

DFC will be the science topic along with statistical analysis of the data (Lippke, Schuett-Hames) Rowton will redistribute the DFC white paper upon request

Quinn added an extra item for today regarding the CMER workplan. We do need to get this done so that we can look to it for guidance. The state is in the process of creating a master plan for monitoring; and the MDT, in cooperation with CMER, will forward the forestry piece of this. The design of the adaptive management program has been forwarded to the Independent Science Panel for review and comment and placeholder language for the effectiveness monitoring pieces that come from CMER is included in the draft. One of the things that will come out of the workplan will be an appendix with study plans attached. This will help to incorporate the effectiveness monitoring pieces from CMER. Therefore, it is important that we keep making progress on the workplan. McNaughton said that there has been progress on this but it does need more work. Sturhan and Pleus agreed to staff the drafting work group.

The MDT report may be released as soon as February for CMER review.

Meeting adjourned.